COMPATIBILITY OF THE NHAL ALTERNATIVES
Land Management, Recreation, and Wild Resources

In this document, the Land Management, Recreation, and Wild Resources Areas Alternatives are presented separately so that a range of alternatives on each topic can be presented and discussed. Each of these groups of alternatives may interact in a variety of ways. Some recreational goals and activities are more or less compatible with some land management goals and activities. This section is designed to outline and explain areas of compatibility and incompatibility between Land Management, Recreation, and Wild Resources Areas.

The Wild Resources Area Alternatives are different from the Land Management and Recreation Alternatives. As explained in the Wild Resources Areas description (page 83), Wild Resources Areas are actually one of the six Land Management Classifications that will eventually be applied to the entire property. Other classifications include Native Community Management, Forest Production, Scenic Resources Management, etc. In an attempt to focus on the objectives and techniques for different areas, rather than broad titles, we did not use the Land Classification System in the Land Management and Recreation Alternatives. Wild Resources Areas are the exception to this because of their specific restrictions on recreation and land management practices.

Land Management and Recreation

All of the Land Management Alternatives (1-6) for the NHAL are compatible with all of the Recreation Alternatives (A-D). Most potential conflicts between land management goals and activities and recreational goals and activities occur not at the broad scale of the NHAL alternatives but at a more site specific level.

The exception is the recreational goal of providing remote experiences where people could hike or canoe without seeing or hearing signs of human activity. This recreational goal would prohibit various forms of active management and more developed recreational activities. This recreational goal is covered in the Wild Resources Areas Alternatives where specific restrictions on management actions and recreation are outlined.

Land Management Alternative 6 is a little different in that it is designed to represent a resource management scenario which would be compatible with the maximum possible Wild Resources designation outlined in Wild Resources Alternative V. This relationship does not necessarily imply the restrictions on recreation that are part of a wild resources designation, however, reduced road access is likely. These are intentionally presented separately to allow public input on a variety of options.

Some activities may appear incompatible on the maps, but when examined at the site-level, are not incompatible. For instance, it may appear that Alternative D proposes ATV trails through Forested Wetlands in the northwest corner of the NHAL. However, the actual locations of these trails would be on upland sites within the broad Forested Wetlands area.

Forest management near trails and campgrounds can be a source of conflict, however, such conflicts have been rare on the NHAL. Typically, forest management activities are designed to minimize aesthetic

impacts or enhance recreational facilities and trails. A recent study indicates that most forest recreators do not think small timber harvests are incompatible with their recreational activities[1].

Recreation and Wild Resources Areas

Wild Resources Areas have very specific recreation goals. They provide remote or somewhat remote, non-motorized recreational experiences for people seeking solitude and challenge. Wild Resources Areas can have two different Recreation Subclassifications: Type 1 and Type 2. Type 1 Wild Resources Areas are the most restrictive, providing the most remote experiences. In these areas, all roads would be closed. Bicycles, horses, snowmobiles, ATVs, and, in most cases, motorboats would not be allowed. All campsites in Type 1 Wild Resources Areas would be limited to a fire ring and box latrine. Type 2 areas are somewhat less remote. They would have a few roads, and be closed to motorized recreation. Campsites in Type 2 Wild Resources Areas would be limited to a fire ring, picnic table, and box latrine/ pit toilet.

The Recreation Alternatives provide a range of options for trails, camping, and other recreational facilities. Some aspects of the Recreation Alternatives were designed to be compatible with the Wild Resources Alternatives, such as snowmobile trails in Recreation Alternative A. Wild Resources Area Alternative I was designed to be compatible with all the Recreation Alternatives. The other Wild Resources Areas Alternatives propose some areas that currently contain snowmobile trails or bicycle trails which would require the closure of these trails.

Recreation Alternative A also proposes two Non-Motorized Areas, which would provide places for quiet, non-motorized recreation but still allow land management, as opposed to Wild Resources Areas which prohibit almost all land management activities.

Table 3 below compares Wild Resources Areas I-V with Recreation Alternatives A-D. The number of Wild Resources Areas that are incompatible with each Recreation Alternative is shown, along with the total number of Wild Resources Areas in each alternative. These areas vary widely in size. Please keep in mind while evaluating this chart that the next step, developing the "preferred alternative," will probably not involve simply choosing one set of alternatives, but will combine elements of several alternatives to create a holistic "preferred alternative" for the management of the NHAL.

[1] Marcouiller, Dave and Terry Mace. 1999. *Forests and Regional Development: Economic Impacts of Woodland Use for Recreation and Timber in Wisconsin.* Report G3694. University of Wisconsin System, Cooperative Extension, Madison, WI.

Table 3. The compatibility of Wild Resources Areas Alternatives I-V and Recreation Alternatives A-D for the NHAL

	Wild Resources Areas Alternative I (3 areas)	**Wild Resources Areas Alternative II** (5 areas)	**Wild Resources Areas Alternative III** (6 areas)	**Wild Resources Areas Alternative IV** (11 areas)	**Wild Resources Areas Alternative V** (13 areas)
Recreation Alternative A	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	Compatible	One area incompatible due to a bike trail
Recreation Alternative B	Compatible	Two areas incompatible due to snowmobile trails	Two areas incompatible due to snowmobile trails	Five areas incompatible due to snowmobile trails and one due to a bike trail and a snowmobile trail.	Six areas incompatible due to snowmobile trails and one due to a bike trail and a snowmobile trail
Recreation Alternative C	Compatible	Two areas incompatible due to snowmobile trails	Two areas incompatible due to snowmobile trails	Five areas incompatible due to snowmobile trails and one due to a bike trail and a snowmobile trail.	Six areas incompatible due to snowmobile trails and one due to a bike trail and a snowmobile trail
Recreation Alternative D	Compatible	Two areas incompatible due to snowmobile trails	Two areas incompatible due to snowmobile trails	Five areas incompatible due to snowmobile trails and one due to a bike trail and a snowmobile trail.	Five areas incompatible due to snowmobile trails, one area due to ATV and snowmobile trails and one due to a bike trail and a snowmobile trail

Land Management and Wild Resources Areas

The goals and restrictions of the range of wild resource alternatives are *incompatible* with Land Management Alternatives 1-5 which are based on natural community goals. Land Management Alternative 6 is based on 36% of the property being in Wild Resources Areas with aesthetics as the primary management goal. We are asking participants to look carefully at these alternatives to understand the tradeoffs between having large areas without active land management versus having the ability to achieve ecological restoration and habitat management goals. It is important to realize that the preferred alternative developed in the next step in the planning process will likely be a combination of elements presented in this range of alternatives rather than being one of the alternatives as presented.

The reason that Land Management Alternatives 1-5 are incompatible with the wild resource alternatives is that most of ecosystems on the NHAL require disturbance for restoration or maintenance. Land Management Alternatives 1-5 are based on extensive studies on the NHAL ecology and almost 100 years of management experience on this property. This collective scientific information was used by an integrated team of endangered species biologists, wildlife biologists, ecologists and foresters to provide the management prescriptions necessary to achieve different land management alternatives. Capabilities

of most lands in the NHAL (dry sandy soil, low nutrients) as well as the information on historic conditions indicated that disturbance dependent forest communities are appropriate across most of the NHAL. These communities include red pine, white pine, jack pine, aspen/birch and red oak. Historic disturbance was ultimately provided by fires but blowdowns, insect infestations and disease were important factors and often provided the dead trees to carry large fires. Landscape level fire is not practical nor desirable with the present culture of this area. Therefore, various active management techniques including timber harvest, scarification (soil disturbance), prescribed fire and planting are used to guide the forest make up. Land Management Alternatives 1-5 provide a range of possible future forest conditions appropriate for the NHAL but all options from aspen to red/white pine depend on some form of active management.

These management techniques are in direct conflict with the recreation experience goals on wild resources areas of having large areas with "little or no resource management activity." The primary benefit of Wild Resources Areas is that they provide large areas suitable for remote, silent-sport recreation with little evidence of human impact. The primary land management tradeoff when designating an area as Wild Resource Type 1 or Type 2 is the lost ability to maintain pine, red oak or aspen/birch communities through active management on the NHAL's predominate sand soils over the long term. Over a period of 100+ years areas designated as Wild Resources Areas on the NHAL will see a significant decrease in red pine, jack pine, red oak and aspen/white birch and a moderate decrease in white pine. Depending on soil type an increase in shade tolerant trees such as red maple, yellow birch, sugar maple and basswood will result.

In order to provide a wide range of alternatives, Land Management Alternative 6 was developed to be compatible with the maximum amount of Wild Resources Areas presented in Wild Resources Alternative V. These Wild Resources Areas were added to the existing management map presented in Land Management Alternative 5. In these Wild Resources Areas the specific natural community goals developed by the team of scientists would not be the specific future desired condition. Instead, the future desired condition is based on the aesthetic goals of large areas void of human influence. The present forest cover (aspen, pine, northern hardwoods etc.) would be allowed to grow old, die and succeed naturally to a shade tolerant forest type. Most natural ecological processes would be allowed to dominate. Natural disturbances such as wind may occur to set back succession and provide regeneration of aspen/birch and some pines. Other natural disturbances such as insect infestations and wild fire may be allowed to impact Wild Resources Areas as long as these events do not threaten adjacent lands. If such a natural disturbance within a Wild Resources Area may threaten adjacent lands it would not be allowed to proceed naturally.